



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,571	07/21/2003	Masaru Iriya	0071-0528P	4799
2292	7590	08/03/2005	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			MIGGINS, MICHAEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/622,571	IRIYA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Michael C. Miggins	1772

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): All rejections employing Topolkarayev.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-13

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
 Michael C. Miggins  
 Primary Examiner  
 Art Unit: 1772

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are addressed in the order presented in the response of 7/28/05.

Applicant's summary of the previous advisory action is acknowledged.

Applicant has argued that the limitation "surface" layer means that the surface layer is uncoated. However, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, "surface" layer merely means that the layer is adjacent to the surface and does not by necessity mean that the layer is the outermost layer or exposed, applicant also uses the term "comprising" which does not exclude the inclusion of other layers. Applicant does not recite that the layer is the outermost layer and "surface" layer does not mean outermost layer or exposed.

The Japanese reference is not at all optional since the rejection states that claims 6-7 are rejected over Shibata and Kuroki and further in view of the Japanese reference.

Applicant has argued that by definition a surface layer is exposed or else it would not be a surface layer. However, as explained above a "surface" layer does not mean and is not equivalent to outermost layer or exposed. Furthermore, a surface layer can have multiple films and applicant uses the term comprising which does not exclude the inclusion of further films and/or coatings at the surface.

With regard to the interview summary, the interview was conducted by examiner Nolan who is no longer with the office. Thus the current examiner of record will only consider what is of record in the interview summary.

The examiner agrees with applicant that as written claims 2 and 6-7 are proper and thus any objection or rejection under 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph is hereby withdrawn.

With regards to the prior art rejections, applicant has argued that the prior art does not teach the recited surface roughness of 0.5 to 4.0 nm. It is argued that Shibata discloses in the examples (par. 0169, table 8) a surface roughness of 40-60 nm. However, Shibata discloses a surface roughness of 80 nm or smaller, which means 0-80 nm thus Shibata's disclosed range overlaps and includes applicant's range of .5 to 4 nm. Furthermore, applicant has shown clear and convincing evidence of an unexpected result. It is well settled that finding the optimum workable range or value is obvious and well within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art (MPEP 2144).

The examiner agrees with applicant's arguments with regards to Topolkaraev and Shibata and as such all rejections employing Topolkaraev as the primary reference have been withdrawn.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Miggins whose telephone number is 571-272-1494. The examiner can normally be reached on 1:00-10:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael C. Miggins  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1772



MCM  
August 2, 2005